

Application No. 10/065, 005
Amendment dated July 22, 2005
Amendment made in response to Office Action dated April 05, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Rejections under 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Klingman (US 6, 219, 736). Applicants respectfully disagree.

As amended, claims 1, 9 or 23 recites an interface unit or a method for communicating between an ISDN-based bus and a processor bus, wherein data in the ISDN-based bus is transferred in ISDN frames divided into a plurality of slots. The interface unit is coupled to the ISDN-based bus and the processor bus for controlling the transfer of data between a device coupled the processor bus and a device coupled to the ISDN-based bus, wherein the interface unit facilitates communication between the device coupled to the ISDN bus and the device coupled to the processor bus, the interface unit is capable of accessing all slots in an ISDN frame.

Klingman, on the other hand describes, a universal serial bus (USB) RAM device to facilitate communication between a USB host and a microcontroller. The RAM device is coupled to a PCI bus and to a USB communication link or bus. The USB bus is coupled to a USB host, having a plurality of USB devices. *See* Klingman, Fig. 1 and col. 2, lines 1-15. As such, Klingman describes data transfer between a USB bus and a processor bus at best. The teachings of Klingman is more analogous to either the high speed data transfer unit coupled to the processor bus or providing an interface unit between the high speed data transfer unit and the processor bus of the present invention. *See* Specification, Fig. 1, elements 160 and 167 and paragraph 0015. This is quite different from the interface unit coupled between the ISDN-based bus and processor bus of the presently claimed invention. *See* Specification, Fig. 1, elements 180, 110 and 167. Klingman makes clear that a USB bus is different from an ISDN bus, evidenced by the necessity of an adaptor to facilitate communication between devices on the USB bus and ISDN bus. *See* Klingman, Figs. 16 and 17. This is further supported by Applicants discussion in the background which distinguishes an ISDN-based bus from USB. *See* Specification at paragraph 0003. For example, a main difference is that the USB protocol is frame based while the ISDN protocol is slot based.

Application No. 10/065, 005
Amendment dated July 22, 2005
Amendment made in response to Office Action dated April 05, 2005

In addition, the Examiner states that the control unit of the RAM interface "is capable of accessing all slots in an ISDN frame...." To support this point, the Examiner points to col. 9, lines 30-50 and col. 20, lines 13-2. See Office Action, mailed April 5, 2005, page 3. Applicants believe that there is a typographical error with respect to the citation to col. 20 lines 13-2. Assuming that the citation should be col. 20, lines 13-24, Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants submit that the text referred to by the Examiner nowhere teaches or suggests accessing all slots of an ISDN frame. From what Applicants can make from the referred text, it describes transferring data using only the B-channel. As discussed by the Applicants, ISDN-based bus communicates through 2 B-channels for data transfer and 1 D-channel for control signals. However, communication through these channels alone does not provide access to all the slots of an ISDN frame as claimed. Furthermore, Klingman would not be concerned with accessing all slots of an ISDN frame since it is focused on the USB protocol, which is frame based. Thus, Applicants submit that Klingman by merely describing transferring data through only channel B does not teach or suggest the capability of accessing all slots of an ISDN frame during a data transfer.

Therefore, based on the foregoing discussion, Applicants submit that claims 1, 9 and 23 are patentable over Klingman. Since claims 2-8, 10-22 are directly or indirectly dependent on claims 1 or 9, these claims are also patentable. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection based on 35 USC § 102 (b).

Application No. 10/065, 005
Amendment dated July 22, 2005
Amendment made in response to Office Action dated April 05, 2005

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe that all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned attorney at his number set out below.

Date: July 22, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Dexter CHIN
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,842

Horizon IP Pte Ltd
8 Kallang Sector
East Wing 7th Floor
Singapore 349282
Tel.: (65) 9836 9908
Fax: (65) 6846 2005